

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claim 49 is canceled herein;
- Claims 5-6 are previously canceled herein;
- Claims 1, 14, 20, 32, 34-36, 42, 43, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, and 57 are amended herein; and
- Claims 1-4, 7-48 and 50-57 are currently pending.

[0003] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 20, 32, 42 and 47 is found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0031], [0055], [0065] and [0079].

[0004] Claims 14, 34-36, 43, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, and 57 have been amended to address minor formalities.

Cited Documents

[0005] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Subramanian:** *Subramanian et al.*, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2005/0018775**
- **Griffits:** *Griffits*, U.S. Patent No. **6,262,776**
- **Markowitz:** *Markowitz et al.*, U.S. Patent No. **6,457,052**

Claims 1-4 and 7-57 Are Non-Obvious Over Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz

[0006] Claims 1-4 and 7-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Subramanian in view of Griffiths in view of Markowitz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended Independent Claim 1

[0007] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest at least the claimed (emphasis added):

- requesting, by the computing device, a second component of the pipeline to alter the manner in which the second component processes a portion of the presentation when the two or more samples are not processed at the expected time and when the first timing error is greater than the second timing error, the altering including **corrective action** to reduce a quality of video filtering of the presentation and reduce a quality of audio decoding of the presentation
- **taking the corrective action by the second component in response to the requesting, wherein the second component is selected from a group comprising multiple components of the pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action**

[0008] The Office has not previously considered the newly amended features of claim 1, shown as emphasized above, and has not cited Subramanian, Griffiths or Markowitz, alone or in combination, for these features.

[0009] However, regarding the claimed “requesting ... a second component of the pipeline to ... alter the manner in which the second component processes a portion of the presentation”, the Office relies on Griffiths, citing figure 11 and various portions of columns 18 and 19 (Office Action, pp. 3-4). Applicant respectfully disagrees that Griffiths teaches or suggests all of the features of claim 1, because Griffiths does not teach or suggest “multiple components of the pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action” as recited in claim 1, as amended.

[0010] In contrast, Griffiths merely suggests that if a frame of video data is deemed as damaging, then the frame of video data will be dropped (Column 19, lines 40-46). Griffiths further suggests that the video decoder is able to make decisions to drop or decode a frame based on quality messages sent from the video renderer (Column 12, lines 41-50). However, Griffiths does not suggest that “multiple components ... are configured to take ... corrective action” as recited in claim 1, as amended, because Griffiths merely suggests that the video decoder is able to make decisions to, for example, drop a frame. Griffiths does not teach or suggest that “multiple components” can drop a frame of video data.

[0011] Regarding the claimed “altering including ...reduc[[ing]] a quality of video filtering of the presentation and reduc[[ing]] a quality of audio decoding of the presentation”, the Office indicates that Subramanian and Griffiths fail to disclose these features, relying instead on Markowitz, citing column 1, lines 43-46 (Office Action, pp. 4-5). Applicant respectfully asserts, however, that Markowitz does not make up for the deficiencies of Subramanian and Griffiths, because Markowitz does not teach or suggest “multiple components of the pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action” as

recited in claim 1, as amended. In contrast, Markowitz merely suggests using a buffer in a user's computer to try to prevent dropping packets during periods of network congestion (column 1, line 40-column 2, line 26). Applicant asserts that the buffer suggested by Markowitz is not analogous to the "multiple components of the pipeline" as recited in amended claim 1. Applicant asserts that the combination Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest "multiple components ... to take the corrective action" as recited in claim 1, as amended.

[0012] Consequently, the combination Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claims 20 and 32

[0013] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claims 20 and 32 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest at least the claimed (emphasis added):

- component ... selected from a group comprising multiple ... components of the ... pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action

[0014] The Office has not previously considered these newly amended features of claims 20 and 32, and has not cited Subramanian, Griffiths or Markowitz, alone or in combination, for these features.

[0015] Without needlessly repeating the reasons presented above in support of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach the features of a "component ... selected from a group

comprising multiple ... components of the ... pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action” as recited in claims 20 and 32, as amended, at least because the combination of the cited references does not suggest the features of the “multiple ... components”.

[0016] Consequently, the combination Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claims 42 and 47

[0017] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claims 42 and 47 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest at least the claimed (emphasis added):

- component ... selected from a group comprising a plurality of ... components of the ... pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action

[0018] The Office has not previously considered these newly amended features of claims 42 and 47, and has not cited Subramanian, Griffiths or Markowitz, alone or in combination, for these features.

[0019] Without needlessly repeating the reasons presented above in support of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach the features of a “component ... selected from a group comprising a plurality of ... components of the ... pipeline that are configured to take the corrective action” as recited in claims 42 and 47, as amended, at least because the

combination of the cited references does not suggest the features of the “plurality of ... components”.

[0020] Consequently, the combination Subramanian, Griffiths and Markowitz does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 3, 4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-57

[0021] Claims 3, 4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-57 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 20, 32, 42 and 47. As discussed above, claims 1, 20, 32, 42 and 47 are allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 3, 4, 7-19, 21-31, 33-41, 43-46 and 48-57 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0022] For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.

[0023] If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application,
Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/ E. John Fain, #60960 /

Dated: 1/12/2010

E. John Fain
(johnf@leehayes.com; 509-944-4756)
Registration No. 60960

Reviewer/Supervisor: Dan Hayes